

RODWYN ANTONIO TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JOHN DOE 2, et al.,

Defendants.

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff’s “Request for the Information and Identification of the Officers described in the following [Case Number]” [Doc. 24] and Plaintiff’s “Request to Rewrite Complaint Concerning [this] Civil Action” [Doc. 25], which the Court construes as a motion to amend his Complaint.

Case 1:23-cv-00098-FDW Document 26 Filed 08/11/23 Page 1 of 2

The Court will grant Plaintiff's motion to amend in that Plaintiff may amend his Complaint once as a matter of course without leave of Court under Rule 15(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff is admonished that any Amended Complaint will be subject to all timeliness and procedural requirements and will supersede the Complaint. Piecemeal amendment will not be permitted. Should Plaintiff fail to timely amend his Complaint in accordance with this Order, this action will be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice to Plaintiff.


The Court will deny without prejudice Plaintiff's request for information and identification of the individuals in the video footage. If Plaintiff's amended complaint, as informed by the video evidence, survives initial review under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e) and 1915A, the Court will order that the North Carolina Attorney General's Office identify the relevant Doe Defendants.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Request for the Information and Identification of the Officers" [Doc. 24] is **DENIED without prejudice** in accordance with the terms of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Request to Rewrite Complaint Concerning [this] Civil Action" [Doc. 25] is **GRANTED** in accordance with the terms of this Order. Plaintiff shall file his amended complaint within 30 days of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: August 11, 2023


Frank D. Whitney
United States District Judge